DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 662 EA 024 265

AUTHOR Rusch, Edith A.; And Others
TITLE The Social Construction of Leadership: Theory to Praxis.
PUB DATE Nov 91
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference on Research on Women and Education (San Jose, CA, November 7-10, 1991).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Discourse Analysis; *Epistemology; Females; *Feminism; Higher Education; *Leadership; *Organizational Change; Racial Bias; Sex Bias; *Theory Practice Relationship; Women Administrators

ABSTRACT

The notion of the "everyday problematic" (Smith 1987) is used to examine the experiences of three doctoral students engaged in research about leadership for women, with a focus on leadership discourse, feminist perspectives, and organizational change. "Everyday problematic" refers to the discrepancy between what is defined as leadership and what women "know" about leadership from personal experiences. The purpose of the paper is to initiate a dialog that critically examines the underlying assumptions about power and knowledge in leadership discourse. An argument is that traditional leadership models and assigned roles create an "everyday problematic" for the "knowers" of leadership. A feminist critique of traditional leadership models is provided, with attention given to the ways in which leadership is socially constructed and how traditional models fail to consider the different perspectives of race and gender. A feminist approach urges the use of a democratic lens that allows multiple perspectives to emerge. Teachers of leaders are challenged to model openmindedness, to behave as learners, and to value communication. The appendix outlines parallels in the works of Mary Parker Follett and James MacGregor Burns. (42 references) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED349662

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF LEADERSHIP: THEORY TO PRAXIS

Edith A. Rusch
Penny Poplin Gosetti
Marge Mohoric

Division of Educational Policy and Management
University of Oregon

Paper presented at
17th Annual Conference on Research on Women and Education
San Jose, CA
November 7-10, 1991

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Rusch

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 024 265

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF LEADERSHIP: FROM THEORY TO PRAXIS

Edith A. Rusch
Penny Poplin Gosetti
Marge Mohoric
University of Oregon

> All rituals are paradoxical and dangerous enterprises.....Dangerous because when we are not convinced by a ritual we may become aware of ourselves as having made them up, thence on to the paralyzing realization that we have made up all our truths, our ceremonies, our most precious conceptions and convictions--all are mere invention, not inevitable understandings about the world at all but the results of mortals imaginings. (Myerhoff, 1978, p.83)

Invisibility. Silence. Inequality. Oppression. Missing viewpoints and perspectives. Contradictions. The words are lost in the empty space, the disparity of the thought. These are the voices and texts that become Dorothy Smith's (1987a) "everyday problematic" for women engaged in and aspiring to leadership in organizations. To define leadership is problematic: what we read, what we hear, what we see, is not leadership as we "know" it. These are the white spaces, the invisibilities that confront men and women in organizations as they struggle to integrate new perspectives of gender, race, and class. This paper examines the "fault line," Smith's referent to that point of rupture where personal experience breaks away from the discourse. We use her notion of the "everyday problematic" (Smith, 1987a) to look at the experiences of three doctoral students engaged in parallel research about leadership for women focusing on leadership discourse, feminist perspectives, and organizational change.

Our goal is to initiate a dialogue that critically examines the underlying assumptions about power and knowledge in leadership discourse; the texts, conversations, writings, rituals, and ceremonies that socially constructs our knowing and understanding of leadership. We propose that textbook leadership models, dialectical relationships, and assigned roles create for each of us an "everyday problematic" as a "knower" of leadership. Within that problematic, we ask the following questions:

- How is leadership socially constructed? Do the ideologies, the socially constructed practices of knowing leadership, perpetuate silence and marginalize women and people of color? How does the selection and organization of knowledge define and cement our social relations in ways that maintain silences and invisibilities?

- How has feminist theory influenced the discourse on leadership? If we use feminist standpoint theory to analyze power and knowledge can we hear marginalized voices? What are the conceptual implications for leadership education for women? Are those implications consistent for men and women?

- What happens when the discourse is modified? What can we learn from a corporate leadership institute dedicated to changing attitudes about the value of diversity? Can observed dynamics among men and women and between men and women engaged in a learning experience dedicated to multiple perspectives become a new source of data for "knowing" leadership?

As educators and doctoral students, our worlds are filled with words, the symbols of our profession, our culture, indeed the symbols of our person. In order to assuage our curiosity about this issue of socialization, we litter our lives with other people's words. The texts that contribute

to the social construction of leadership occupy large physical spaces of our collective worlds, arranged haphazardly in groups of philosophy, theory, history, sociology, feminism, and narrative. Based on Geertz's (1973) notion of "thick description" we collect anthropological data. Our artifacts are the words, symbols, ideas, and methodologies that connect with human experience and emerge as leadership. We are examining, as Geertz explains, the "constructions of other people's constructions" and "sorting out the structures of signification" (p. 9).

The work of John Dewey (1916) provides a starting point for exploring leadership construction. His view of the dialectical relationship between school and society suggests that, as a society, we are profoundly affected by how and what we learn and teach. He speaks of an educational system that promotes personal interest in social relationships and the development of "habits of mind" that fosters openmindedness, originality, and gets beyond ruts and routines or what Myerhoff has called rituals and ceremonies (Myerhoff, 1978, p. 83). Dewey warns that a society that does not want to fall victim to the inequities of stratification and separate classes

> must see to it that all its members are educated to personal initiative and adaptability. Otherwise, they will be overwhelmed by the changes in which they are caught and whose significance or connections they do not perceive. The results will be a confusion in which a few will appropriate to themselves the results of the blind and externally directed activities of others (Dewey, 1916, p. 88).

Based on our experience, we propose that people in positions of leadership, scholars who educate potential leaders, and researchers who study the attributes of leaders are overwhelmed and lack the habits of mind that contribute to achieving the democratic society that Dewey describes. Furthermore, we suggest that the truths of leadership are in a dialectical relationship with the rituals and ceremonies and that this interrelationship makes change all the more difficult.

To explore the values that speak to marginalization or inclusion, we examine what Anderson (1990) calls the "construction of the inner eye," the ability to see or not see the reality of social phenomena (p. 38-39). We believe that how we see and behave related to issues of equity and diversity is, in a large measure, constructed by our professional learning experiences. We also believe our ability to see social phenomena with a variety of lenses is highly influenced by the scholarly messages communicated and modeled in professional education, research, and discourse. This view is supported by Kathy Ferguson (1984) who challenges the perpetuation of a bureaucracy based on the power/knowledge relationship between the discourse and the practice in the field. She puts forth a notion of "language having people" and notes that our "participation in speech consists in joining an already existent flow of activity rather than initiating new activity" (p. 60). Going beyond Ferguson, we suggest that the social construction of leadership, from theory to praxis, is so immersed in traditional dominant white male truths that the "construction of the inner eye" has limited opportunity for multiple perspectives to emerge and change the social realities that foster marginalization.

We begin by examining how each of us has come to "know" leadership both from the textual discourse and our own personal practice. Using multiple perspectives, we examine our experiences, the texts, and the surrounding dialogue looking at what is and is not communicated.

Our "Knowing": Discovering Personal Fault Lines

To See With New Eyes: Marge's Story

At the age of 25, having been a secretary for seven years, I was promoted to a clerical supervisor position in a public agency. I hired a young man named Brian as a clerk typist. Brian worked for me for eight months. The agency had an annual training school that women were not allowed to attend. All of us held traditional female clerical roles which excluded us from the need for development. After many years of begging to attend I finally convinced my boss that my

superior organizational skills were needed for the registration process of this training school being held at a major university. I was excited about the opportunity to work at registration and hoped to sneak into a few classes to observe what was being taught.

Imagine my surprise on the first morning of registration when Brian came through the line to register as a participant. After completing his registration, I immediately went to find my boss to ask why one of my subordinates was attending the school without my knowledge and further to ask why Brian and not me. His reply has been embedded on my brain for many years. "Well, Brian has a family to support. We can't let him stay too long in that low-paying woman's job." When I responded with, "Do I need to remind you that I am also a single parent, solely responsible for my family, and have been trying to get promoted for three years?", he just shook his head. Brian attended the school and was promoted out of the clerical field within two months. After this unfair treatment, I immediately became an active member of a statewide committee on women's issues. My inner eye was forever changed.

Feminism is Never Easy: Edie's Story

My first recollected encounter with the complexities of equity issues took place 15 years ago, about the time women in Oregon were actively being encouraged to pursue administrative positions. I accepted a position as a "key teacher", a quasi-administrative role, in an elementary school. The principal openly acknowledged that learning how to work with a female was a most difficult struggle for him. He was accustomed to "giving" equality to someone he mentored; I already owned a sense of equality. His sense of tradition dictated male and female roles; I had been raised as my father's "oldest son" and exhibited as many male leader behavior traits as any man he had mentored. He was used to sharing his personal world with a colleague; I had little background in basketball and fishing. The common ground we found was our journey as learners. Together we shared the complexities of new learning experiences, coming to understand through frequent discussions that gender issues, leadership styles, and organizational changes aren't much different than long division or latitude and longitude. They all require a new set of skills, lots of practice, a good sense of humor, and inordinate patience. That was until we attended a professional workshop on androgyny.

The word "androgyny" almost did him in. Everything that my colleague understood about his world seemed to be in question again. The speaker was identifying character traits and personal habits that made him uncomfortable. So many of the ideas fit him: sensitive. open, intuitive, supportive, but the presenter kept referring to these qualities as female in nature. His fellow principals (all male) laughed, made snide remarks and eventually he joined in their rejection. When he found me looking at him, he raised his eyebrows and shrugged. I realized that the subject of androgyny was harder than the concept. Together we had been making great intellectual leaps through gender issues, but his emotional system was not following. Even though he had been exploring and practicing changes in ritual for the past two years, somehow learning about what he was doing seemed to threaten his personal existence. I sensed a new barrier in our communication

He would never talk to me about the workshop on androgyny. The first few weeks, his interactions with me changed dramatically He would no longer acknowledge any vulnerability and his leadership became far more directive. It took me years of reflection and other experiences with change to understand what had happened. The traditions that he had been changing were headquartered in his soul. Modifying the leadership and gender behaviors seemed possible until someone created a label for his changes and his own peers openly derided the concepts. The social constructions of who he was as a school administrator were too deeply embedded; he could not risk being viewed as a feminist, and yet that was the model of leadership he had been working on.

The construction of my own feminist eye began at that moment. I began to observed and feel the agonizing challenges faced by educational leaders trying to integrate new perspectives and knowledge. My own thinking and adapting behaviors when faced with disruption of what I

"know" are aptly captured by Dewey's notion of being overwhelmed. I know sincere conscientious principals who take early retirement because the emerging challenges of equity and pluralism are too hard. I grapple with men and women trying to understand the need for a special organization to take on the mentoring of women in school administration. I mute my feminist voice to attain and retain leadership positions. I am an expert about the margins in our educational system for single parents. I continue to be confounded by the lack of open conversations with my professional colleagues about the complexities of behaving in democratic ways. The silence is deafening.

Who "Knows" Leadership?: Penny's Story

I experienced my first professional position in higher education as a residence hall director. Although my first year was rough I did well enough to be offered a professional position within the central housing office my second year at the university. It was a challenging position combining responsibilities for program development, supervision, and general administrative tasks. I felt that my supervisor provided solid direction and feedback while consistently demonstrating his appreciation of my contributions. I was encouraged to take on new responsibilities and came to be included in most central office projects and decision-making. I enjoyed my position and valued the feedback and suggestions I received about my performance.

One day I had a conversation with my supervisor which left me very confused about my abilities as a leader. Approaching him with a staff problem that troubled me he suggested that I needed to "toughen up" and distance myself from the situation. My reaction was instantaneous; hardening myself meant compromising those values and characteristics that I believed to be important to my success as a leader. When I entered the student affairs profession I desired to be an involved and caring administrator who listened to the needs of students and staff. I did not want to be a distant and aloof university employee whose primary concerns ran towards paperwork and proper procedures.

My supervisor's feedback did not fit my picture of effective leadership. Although I tried to explain the feelings of compromise and loss that resulted from his suggestion, I do not think he understood. I left our meeting feeling angry, confused, and somewhat betrayed. I questioned whether I was able and, more importantly, willing to follow the path of leadership. As much as I respected this man, I felt that he resisted the temptation to include compassion and concern as a leadership strategy. It is not that he didn't care. Rather, he hid his emotions and feelings about people and situations behind a wall of rationalism and objectivity. Whether because of my respect for this supervisor or because I saw it as a necessity for professional success, I began to incorporate his suggestion to toughen up and create distance. Although many situations became less emotionally draining (or as a male might interpret - easier to deal with) I can't help but feel (in hindsight) that I buried some of those characteristics that made me comfortable with what I do and who I am as a leader.

Leadership Constructed from Text

We use the "fault line," as described by Dorothy Smith (1987), to examine what is learned about leadership from textbooks and other professional writing used to educate and socialize leaders. This concept allows us to examine the ideological assumptions found in textbooks in a way that is particularly sensitive to the suppressed interests of members of disempowered, marginalized groups. Smith describes the "textually modified relations of ruling" that define knowledge from a male perspective for both males and females. Based on our experience, we suggest that the recorded and mediated models of male leadership define the relations of ruling for race and class, as well. Women, people of color, and selected classes are excluded from the positions and from the dialogue. Apple (1990), who examines educational ideology and curriculum notes that "one can think about knowledge as being unevenly distributed among social and economic classes, occupational groups, different age groups, and groups of different power"

(p. 16). He goes on to describe education as a "selection and organization of social knowledge" noting that the knowledge and the selection process itself represent social interests. We agree with Apple, but add the argument that the knowledge that is not selected also defines and cements the social relations.

A primary example of the selection and organization of social knowledge is found in the work of historian James MacGregor Burns. Specific chapters of his book Leadership (1978), or writings that reference his work, are a standard inclusion in educational administration courses. He is well-known for his discussion of the relations between leaders and followers. His concept of transformational leadership is not only studied extensively, but also serves as the foundation for the work of other leadership scholars.

Burns defines leadership as an aspect of power. His concept of transformational leadership speaks to raising self and others to higher levels of motivation and morality. He focuses on mutuality and support for common purpose. In his words,

> Leadership over human beings is exercised when persons with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with other, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources so as to arouse, engage, and satisfy the motives of followers...
>
> Leaders and followers may be inseparable in function, but they are not the same. The leader takes the initiative in making the leader-led connection; it is the leader who creates the links that allow communication and exchange to take place...
>
> The leader is more skillful in evaluating followers' motives, anticipating their responses to an initiative, and estimating their power bases, than the reverse. Leaders continue to take the major part in maintaining and effectuating the relationship with followers and will have the major role in ultimately carrying out the combined purpose of leaders and followers. (p. 21)

Burn's theory, when examined critically, shows several contradictions. The traditions of patriarchy are most visible in his language. The notions of being "more skillful," of having to take the "major role" in action, and "allowing links" of communication denote a relation of ruling that does not recognize equality. Even though his emphasis is on relational attributes, most of the language speaks to subject-object connections. When elaborating on specific actions, Burns theorizes that transformational leaders have reached the highest stages of moral, intellectual, and personal development as defined by the research of Erikson, Maslow, and Kohlberg, each of whom used male subjects for his research. These male hierarchical models have become the ideals to which potential leaders aspire.

> ...leaders hold enhanced influence at the higher levels of the need and value hierarchies. They can appeal to the more widely and deeply held values, such as justice, liberty, and brotherhood. They can expose followers to the broader values that contradict narrower ones or inconsistent behavior. They can refine aspirations and gratifications to help followers see their stake in new, program-oriented social movements. Most important, they can gratify lower needs so that higher motivations will arise to elevate the conscience of men and women (Burns, 1978, p.43).

In a five hundred page treatise, Burns cites only four women, two of whom are references. Other than a brief description of Joan of Arc, the power and leadership roles of men are the sum total of Burns' leadership examples. He establishes a hierarchical and patriarchal order for transformational leadership to take place. In all his discussions of higher purpose and ethical

aspirations he makes few references to equality for women and minorities or for attention to gender and class issues. The silence and invisibility in Burns' treatise are powerful teachers of leadership.

Noting the extensive reference to Burns in current management literature, we began a detailed study of the bibliographies of other leadership scholars. An obscure reference in a research project on women in leadership led to the work of Mary Parker Follett (1942, 1949), a political and business philosopher during the 1920s and 1930s who is still described today as being "the most modern management expert" (Wren, 1987, p. 264). She is credited with being the first writer to present a comprehensive theoretical view of administration of the modern organization (Fleming, 1982). A close reading of her collected papers, Dynamic Administration (Metcalf, H. & Urwick, L., 1942) and her business lectures, Freedom and Co-ordination (1949) leads us to challenge the originality of Burn's concepts of transformational leadership. Writings and lectures by Follett as early as 1927 contained references to transformational leadership, the interrelationship of leadership and followership, and the power of collective goals of leaders and followers. Burns makes no reference to her work. Appendix A details selected parallel themes in their work.

A review of books and current periodicals that discuss leadership and management found few written after 1980 that do not hold the work of Burns in high regard. Burns' treatise on transformational leadership has become the foundation for the popular books of Bennis and Nanus (1985), Bennis, (1989), Peters and Austin (1985), Peters and Waterman (1982), and Sergiovanni (1990). Bennis and Nanus assign attributes to the individuals described as successful leaders that match those described by Follett(1942, 1949). Intensive review of bibliographies revealed the small circle of white male writers who quote and reference one another, crediting mentorship to Bennis, Burns, Drucker (1958, 1966) or McGregor (1960, 1966). A cursory search of Drucker and McGregor found reference to the work of Follett in their earliest writings but none of these scholars give credit to her words despite the fact that Drucker (1958) credits her with being the "most quoted, but least heeded of all students of organizations" (p.8). We do not question the sincerity and quality of the aforementioned work; the principles each of these men adhere to are grounded in a relational leadership concept that attempts to move beyond hierarchy and rational systems. But we are troubled by the lack of reference to Follett's work. The silence and invisibility persists.

Other texts about leadership show similar patterns. Most are authored by men about men. A recent publication by Harvard business professor Zalesnik (1989), provides insight about the progress of perspectives about women in the corporate world. Not only does the index show no references to gender issues, women are listed in the index with subheadings of "and emotions," "and hysteria," and "Mary Kay's beauty consultants." Further examination of the reference indexed under women found that the issues discussed were related to both men and women, however, no specific reference to men or males exists in the index. We could assume that the entire book is for and about men, consequently there is a need for special references to women. Although we did not attempt to review a large sampling of current leadership literature, the best known work of scholars and current popular texts make no reference to issues of gender, race, and class. Discussions of values and ethics speak to honesty and integrity but avoid the topics related to a commitment to diversity and equality. Again we suggest that the silences loudly communicate oppression and patriarchy. Even more critical is that the invisibility of the issues, the lack of dialogue surrounding leadership practice contributes to the perpetuation of rituals and truths in the workplace. The construction of the inner eye has a severe astigmatism.

A study of school administrators (Kempner,1991) gives us some insight related to the social construction of occupational culture and ideology. Using a data set taken from 144 semi-structured interviews and 440 questionnaire responses of a stratified sample of school administrators, Kempner looks at the myths and false consciousness that govern the culture of professionalism among school administrators. He finds that most school administrators have little value for the university-based course work that emphasize philosophy or theory. Most practitioners emphasize

the rational-technical approach to their tasks, indicating that practical experiences and management tools help them be better leaders. He notes that they "adhere to the myth of a science of administrative control. Their perspective of leadership is one based on power, control, and domination, as reflected in the militaristic and athletic metaphors used by many of the men" (p. 113). Kempner concludes that most interviewees "simply wished to reproduce the existing style and manner of educational management and did not reflect on the moral and democratic dimensions of their profession" (p. 114).

When he examines the data for issues related to equity, Kempner cites responses of "no problem" as an example of the false consciousness that still pervades the educational establishment. He also notes that minority interviewees do not agree with the "no problem" perspective. Few administrators discuss the need for fairness and justice in their schools and those who profess democratic attitudes, "could offer only vague generalizations." Kempner speculates that either their awareness was minimal or "their education, administrative training and socialization did not offer them the language to communicate a democratic vision for the school in any but the most general of terms" (p. 117). Kempner concludes that the myths that define success for school administrators includes male models of discipline and power, business (also male) models of the administrative science, and anti-intellectual models of training that focus on mentoring by skilled and traditional veterans. Kempner concludes that university programs contribute to the problem

> by focusing on the acquisition of skills and presuming a science of administration. Administrators and university programs that accept uncritically the metaphors of business, the military, and athletic contests are subscribing to myths that are antithetical to the ideals of democracy. The preeminence of professional expertise in educational administration has exalted authoritative knowledge and defined what the schools should be and who is most qualified to lead them. We should question how well university certification programs are educating administrators to be democratic leaders who are aware of their moral responsibilities to the citizens they serve. (p. 120)

From the Standpoint of Feminists

To understand what we know and how we know it, we should first acknowledge historical traditions of who can know. As Harding (1987) explains,

> Feminists have argued that traditional epistemologies, whether intentionally or unintentionally, systematically exclude the possibility that women could be 'knowers' or agents of knowledge; they claim that the voice of science is a masculine one; that history is written from only the point of view of men (of the dominant class and race); that the subject of a traditional sociological sentence is always assumed to be a man. (p. 3)

So too, we can argue that visions of leadership originate from a dominant white male perspective. Women and people of color have not been knowers in the discourse on leadership. Their voices have been silenced; their presence tolerated but not acknowledged.

In a world where silences and invisibilities abound, how do we begin the process of exposure; recognizing that which is not said and questioning that which is considered "right" and "natural?" How do we examine the construction of our inner eye created from those values and beliefs passed on to us through educational and professional training? How do we, as Jane Flax (1990) asks, make the familiar seem strange and in need of explanation?

Feminist theories and methodologies offer tools not only for analyzing the discourse on leadership but also for proposing change. This feminist perspective comes from, "diverse groups of people who take varying positions on particular issues and who identify with a range of political positions" (Acker, Barry, and Esseveld,1991, p. 150). We choose here to utilize the perspective

of Hester Eisenstein (1983), who in her comprehensive book on contemporary feminist thought suggests that the term "feminist" is,

> an element of visionary, futurist thought [which] encompasses a concept of social transformation that, as part of the eventual liberation of women, will change all human relationships for the better. Although centrally about women [and] their experience, feminism is therefore also fundamentally about men, and about social change" (p. xiv).

We suggest that feminist perspectives offer us new lenses with which to view the world of leadership. Not only do they offer a voice to those who have been silenced and substance to those who have been invisible, they also help expose the "natural" elements of leadership which have, in fact, been constructed and ritualized.

One way in which feminist perspectives accomplish this is through a recognition of and emphasis on experience and viewpoint. Harding (1987) points out that a "distinctive feature of feminist research is that it generates its problematics from the perspective of women's experiences. It also uses these experiences as a significant indicator of the 'reality' against which hypotheses are tested" (p. 7). This perspective is in contrast to the traditional and dominant ways of knowing encapsulated in Western empirical thought. The empiricist approach to knowing relies on the separation and independence of the knower from the subject matter, the removal of the subject from its cultural, historical, and personal contexts, and an emphasis on value-free theories and practices (M. Gergen, 1988). Feminist perspectives recognize that,

> perceptions of phenomena are determined not only by the things themselves but also by our mindset, our individual consciousness and understanding. This, in turn, depends on our social interaction with phenomena and our unique body-brain-mind history. Our viewpoint is therefore derived not only from our specific material conditions and relations but also from our understanding of them, our consciousness. (Berman, 1989, p.242)

This perspective underlies the basic tenets of feminist standpoint theory. "Feminist standpoint is not something that anyone can have by claiming it," argues Harding (1987). Feminist standpoint is achieved by engaging in "the intellectual and political struggle necessary to see nature and social life from the point of view of that disdained activity which produces women's social experiences instead of from the partial and perverse perspective available from the 'ruling gender' experience of men" (p. 185). In a 1990 article on feminism and anti-enlightenment critiques Harding describes some specific beliefs held by feminist standpoint theorists. First, she explains the notion that standpoint theorists can provide a less distorted representation of the world by ceasing to blindly follow scientific methods such as ahistorical principles of inquiry or point-of-viewless objectivism. Second, citing Smith's (1987a) "line of fault" which occurs between dominant knowledge and women's experience, Harding describes the standpoint belief that knowledge is grounded in experience. Third, Harding argues that unitary consciousness is an obstacle to understanding and suggests that standpoint theory, "analyzes the essentialism that androcentrism assigns to women, locates its historical conditions, and proposes ways to counter it" (p. 99).

Standpoint theories go beyond the simple dualisms of empiricist knowing by arguing for the abandonment of misleading dualistic notions of mind versus body and reason versus emotion and replacing "the masculine preoccupation with reductionism and linearity with views emphasizing holism and complex interdependencies" (Rose cited in K. Gergen, 1988, p. 31). This understanding allows us to move beyond the most basic duality of leadership discourse; that of leader/follower where "natural" leaders represent the values of a white, male model and followers become marginal. Feminist standpoint helps make visible the leader/follower dichotomy in the works of Burns (1978) despite his arguments for a relational and collective leadership. Burns describes an omniscient leader who does for and to "his" followers by exposing them to broader

values, by refining their aspirations and gratifications, and by gratifying their lower needs so that higher motivations will arise (p. 43). Implicit in this picture of a leader is the dichotomous image of a follower who is unable to determine her own aspirations or needs and is out of synch with the broader (read: better) values of a white, dominant patriarchal system of leadership.

Standpoint theories also help us see the ahistorical and decontextualized perspectives of the dominant leadership model. Speaking of women's experience in the domestic world, Smith (1987b) explains that, "the concepts and terms in which the world of men is thought [are imposed] as the concepts and terms in which women must think their world" (p. 86). By viewing actions, behaviors, desires, and potential through the concepts and terms of white dominant male leaders, leadership discourse not only removes women and people of color from their historical, cultural, and personal contexts but also provides the knowledge by which they "must think their world." Joanne Martin (1990) illustrates this point in her discussion of a CEO's story about his company's efforts to help women employees balance the demands of work and home. The CEO tells of a pregnant female employee who arranged to have her Caesarean section just prior to the launching of a major new product. Insisting that she stay home, he provided a closed circuit television so she could monitor the launching activities. He explains that although this employee was "extraordinarily important" to the project, "she [stayed] home for three months ... because we [thought it] an important thing for her to do" (p. 339).

When viewed through the dominant conceptual scheme of organizations and leadership, pregnancy, an activity of the private domain, does not "fit." The traditionally male public world of politics, economics, and organizations does not include the conception of children and the nurturing of family. Women leaders must, therefore, "think their world" in the concepts and terms of the dominant discourse. From the perspectives of rationality, hierarchy, competition, efficiency, and productivity (Martin, 1990), the dominant traditions of leadership disregard women's personal and historical contexts welcoming their offers to dictate the readiness of their children to be born and solicitously providing opportunities to pursue business activities while recuperating from surgery. What different actions might be taken if the dominant discourse is not imposed on women's concepts and terms? If the context of their lives provides the dominant "knowing" about private and public domains how might we revisualize the current notions of "balancing demands" and "fitting in?" Expanding the boundaries of our inner eye will help us begin to view the silent and invisible worlds of people in the margins.

We should reiterate here that standpoint is more than an individual's bias or position of interest. It is the assertion that, "there are some perspectives on society from which, however well-intentioned one may be, the real relations of humans with each other and with the natural world are not visible" (Hartsock, 1987, p. 159). Feminist standpoint perspective, argues Harding (1990), makes the overlapping and conflicting relations and structures of our social order appear visible for the first time. Furthermore, women, because they have struggled against male supremacy, will offer clearer and more comprehensive visions of social reality than will perspectives only available from men (Harding, 1991).

A clearer and more comprehensive vision is available to those people who find themselves thinking, acting, and "knowing" who they are out of contradictory social locations; outside and within, margin and center (Harding, 1991). Marginalized people who live and work on both sides (margins and center) have a perspective of the relations between their work and the "ruling work" that is not visible to those people only engaged in dominant culture activities. Collins (1991) refers to people who have these uniquely distinct visions of social reality as "outsiders within." She explains that as a person from the margins, an outsider within chooses not to partake in full insider status; that is, she does not internalize the dominant world view nor does she further the culture in ways prescribed by that culture. In this way, the outsider within retains a standpoint apart from the dominant group.

Women and people of color who have attained leadership positions are outsiders to the dominant white male culture within organizations. We believe that they should strive not only to maintain their outsider within status, but to cherish and nurture all that it entails. This includes carrying the special responsibility to work towards change. As outsiders, we see the fault lines which exist between the dominant leadership models and our own experience. Therefore, we not only experience a different reality than the dominant group, but we are also able to provide, as Collins points out, a different interpretation of that social reality. As insiders, we are able to examine our personal and cultural experiences within the context of the dominant culture. Paradoxically, this process helps illuminate the anomalies of the dominant culture allowing us to encourage and institutionalize outsider within ways of seeing (Collins, 1991).

Unfortunately, many marginalized people who attain leadership positions, are unable to maintain an outsider within status. Seeking ways to climb the hierarchical ladder of leadership we are bombarded with advice from books such as The Managerial Woman (Hennig & Jardim, 1976) and Breaking the Glass Ceiling (Morrison, White, & Velsor, 1987)) and seminars on dressing for success which describe how women must look and behave in order to succeed in a man's organizational world. Feeling it necessary to internalize the concepts and terms of the dominant discourse, many of us begin to use such perspectives to think our own world as well as the worlds of our marginalized colleagues. Our confused attempts to "fit in" often result in our focus on the supposed weaknesses of being different rather than on the strengths developed through our experiences in the margins. The silences and invisibilities grow.

Although we have argued here that standpoint theory provides a means to identify and give voice to those people in the margins, some critics suggest that it fosters silence and invisibility through its essentialism, its perpetuation of the dominant Western empiricist culture, and its attempt to universalize the standpoint of a privileged group of women. Flax (1990) argues that standpoint theory assumes that the oppressed have "privileged, unitary, and not just different relation to and ability to comprehend a reality that is 'out there' waiting for our representation" (p. 141). She also believes that "none of us can speak for 'woman' because no such person exists except within a specific set of already gendered relations - to 'man' and to many concrete and different women" (p. 27). In his criticism of Harding, K. Gergen (1989) expands this thought by asking what right white, Western feminists have to voice. Noting that the feminist sphere is fractured, he suggests that it is difficult to locate a common perspective that can be generalized across the spectrum of women. Narayan (1989) provides a non-Western feminist's concern about standpoint stating that, "if [feminists] fail to see the contexts of their theories and assume that their perspective has universal validity for all feminists, they tend to participate in the dominance that western culture has exercised over non-western culture" (p. 263).

Harding (1991) and Smith (1987a) offer an interpretation of standpoint that differs from these criticisms. Smith suggests that standpoint should not be equated with a world view that universalizes a particular experience. Instead, she argues that it "creates the space for an absent subject, and an absent experience that is to be filled with the presence and spoken experience of actual women speaking of and in the actualities of their everyday" (p. 107). Harding takes this idea a step further by explaining that,

> It is not the experiences or the speech that provides the grounds for feminist claims; it is rather the subsequently articulated observations of and theory about the rest of nature and social relations - observations and theory that start out from, that look at the world from the perspective of women's lives. (p. 124)

We believe that the perspectives offered by Harding and Smith hold much promise for identifying the margins and hearing the silences of leadership discourse. Harding in asking who should start out the "observations of and theory about the rest of nature and social relations" argues that knowledge-seeking such as this requires democratic, participatory politics. We agree and suggest

that the process begin, not with the lens of white, privileged feminists as noted by Gergen and Flax, but with a democratic lens that allows multiple perspectives to emerge. In pursuing this course we should take care to use lenses which prevent the further marginalization of voices. We should find ways when expanding and reconstructing our inner eye to preserve relationships which are free from domination. We should, as we identify margins and recognize voices, ensure equal representation without succumbing to the seductive attractiveness of relativism.

Praxis: One Corporate Version

The power of ideologies, concepts, and theories is their ability to be applied to the production of change. While ideology, concept, and theory are abstract, the production of change is personal. Hence, the discussion of one organization's attempt to change leaders' attitudes and behaviors can best be told from the personal observations of a "knower". The following analysis is, therefore, not a dispassionate and analytical piece about how leadership should be taught, but rather an account of the various strategies that one person used in her attempt to change the discourse. It was an attempt to further develop the inner eye of the trainer, faculty, and students with a goal of focusing on how diversity awareness is addressed, or not addressed, in one executive leadership program.

In 1988 I responded to an advertisement in the Wall Street Journal for a position leading an intensive executive education program for an international firm. Four months into the company's selection process, and after much research on my part, I decided this job would give me new insights about leadership. I also believed they needed me. My experiences in management development, leadership, and diversity education provided a unique fit to the needs of this organization. I was notified that as one of five finalists I would be meeting the other four candidates during a three-day assessment. That night I dreamed my competitors would be pale, male, and wear grey suits with red ties. I wore a black turtle neck dress with pearls when I met my four competitors; all pale, male, and wearing the corporate suit of my dream. For the next three years I learned and taught executive leadership.

Awareness of the changing work force in the 1980s and early 1990s caused leaders of the company to recognize that changing the corporate culture to allow people from diverse backgrounds to live up to their fullest potential was critical to their survival. The company needed to be transformed into an effective competitor in a cyclical industry. They needed a unifying vision, enhanced knowledge base, new skills, leadership, and teamwork to bring the company from bare survival to a profitable organization positioned for growth in the global marketplace. The executive team recognized that an intensive development program was a prerequisite for survival and that it could accelerate the normal process of change. As a result, the Leadership Institute, a pioneering corporate executive education program, was designed to refine and change the attitudes and behaviors of company leaders. The primary goal was to form a value foundation focusing on customers, quality, teamwork, innovation and integrity. The institute's objectives included: 1) building a market/customer-focused enterprise; 2) building unity of purpose by communicating and strengthening commitment to the company's vision, values, and principles; 3) improving leadership skills and instill a sense of responsibility for leading the company into the future; 4) developing a broad business perspective and business ownership attitudes and competencies; 5) becoming more creative and innovative in running the business; and 6) developing communication, cooperation, and a sense of teamwork across unit lines. These objectives and values formed the foundation for a four-week intensive education program delivered to 350 executives over a two-year period (one week every four to six months). The curriculum was structured to reinforce leadership practices that supported and reflected the five values.

My first three months on the job included orientation to the company and to the institute. My assignment involved taking an in-depth look at how the subject of valuing a diverse work force could be integrated into the existing executive education program. The expectations of the

corporate leaders were contradictory. On the one hand they knew the program needed improvement; on the other hand, they seemed uncomfortable with changing a successful program. They were interested in my perceptions assuming that since I was female and had a background of diversity awareness and training I would be able to make recommendations for improving the program. I would like to think this was an awareness or acknowledgment of the value of standpoint. However, as is often the case, it was one woman being asked to speak for all women, a rather essentialistic view.

As I reviewed the curriculum, I noted that the original design team appeared to rely on the popular leadership writings of Bennis, Burns, Peters, Drucker and McGregor. Most readings and references were written by men about men. There seemed to be an assumption that by teaching leadership, awareness about diversity would follow. This was not the case as I discovered through conversations with institute graduates and analyses of evaluations. The silences and invisibilities of people on the margins were unmistakable. While the company had stated goals and an internal committee on diversity, there was no strong commitment to changing a corporate culture that had for decades worked from a white male perspective.

I next observed and participated in a pilot class. It was very clear that the program design did not factor in diversity awareness. During a team building exercise in an outdoor setting the only female was assigned roles as nurse, helper, radio operator...all passive, supporting roles. This trend continued in future classes. Other signs of an insensitivity to diversity included a primarily white male faculty, selected historical readings about leadership written by white males, faculty who did not use inclusive (male/female) language and who were not coached to an awareness of textualized notions of gender, race, and class, and a program staff who received little diversity awareness or training. One graphic example of a lack of sensitivity to diversity involved the use of condoms as a reward for the winners of a creativity competition. The specific prize combined with the established credibility of the presenter created an atmosphere where inappropriate jokes and behavior were used. Male and female members of the class said they were very uncomfortable with people's behavior after the condoms were given out.

A change was definitely in order. Now the challenge. What strategies could be used to begin to create a new inner eye, to help faculty and leaders in the program begin to see how their own attitudes and behaviors create a work atmosphere that includes or excludes people. The teamwork objective of the institute was a good foundation upon which to build this awareness. How can people feel a member of the team if leaders do not show awareness or attention to hostile work environments that limit their inclusion? My review of the curriculum included a focus on process and content of the teaching. What materials were read and not read? What subjects were taught and not taught? Who were the faculty and how were they teaching their subjects? How did faculty and staff modeling affect learners in the institute?

Because I previously taught seminars on the subject of valuing diversity, was an active member of a statewide committee on the status of women and minorities, and held positions with affirmative action responsibilities, I had a perspective that helped me see the subtle messages that someone without that experience might not have noticed. For example, videotapes of key leadership strategies in the institute were narrated by a football personality. It did not occur to anyone that participants might not be able to identify with this person, or even know who he was. They assumed that football was a universal field upon which to build leadership concepts.

From my standpoint these approaches to curriculum excluded the voices from the margins. Not all of the teaching strategies were exclusive, some provided rich opportunities to discuss the value of diversity. One particularly powerful strategy involved an outdoor program where leadership and teamwork were developed through simulated survival and rescue experiences. Since we were in an outdoor setting and stripped of our business attire and facades, all our

assumptions about each other were painfully visible. This created an opportunity to observe and discuss behaviors that were negative and positive toward others, and to create diversity awareness.

I kept a personal journal during the institute. One journal entry that had particular meaning to me follows:

> Today I worked as observer during an exercise to save a victim from a raging river. The small team of rescuers included one male of slight build, one female, one black male, and six fairly large white males. Assumptions were made about all three of the executives described above who were different from the others. Part of the exercise elicited a physical brawn assumption. In reality, physical strength was not needed in any of the exercises to guarantee success, but assumptions were made about that need. At one point the slight male volunteered to be the one who tied a rope to his waist and swam out into the fast water to work the rescue. Another member of the team said 'no, let's have Dave do it, that water looks pretty rough.' Dave had big biceps. Everyone in the group went along with this suggestion as they thought they were competing with another team and wanted to win. At one point the female and black male were holding each end of a limb that had been rigged as a rescue pallet. Each of them were literally pushed out of the way by two other males to carry the victim to safety.
>
> As an observer on the exercise, I chose not to speak up in the exercise debrief as I wanted to see what they had observed. At the end of the debrief the female literally jumped up on a bench and began yelling about how they had pushed her out of the way and not let her participate. Then the other two males said how angry and frustrated they had been (the slight male jumped up on the bench with her and stated he was a champion swimmer but no one had listened to him say he could rescue the victim). Another member of the group said he had observed all of these dynamics and it was exactly how we limit the performance of our staff at work by our stupid assumptions about their skills.
>
> This discussion ended up to be one of the more emotional and productive sessions I have ever participated in on the value of changing ourselves so that we can see how we perceive others, and how our own perceptions shape the relationship. What an education it is to be here and actually observe myself and others experiencing change. Joe, a manager from the south and the main offender in the exercise, came up to me afterwards and with tears said he had been accused of sexual harassment and unfair treatment of people at work and had literally never believed his own bias until this day.

Listening to the stories of leaders who attended the program and observing my own and other's reactions during the classes turned out to be the most painful and illuminating time of my professional life. I observed brilliant, articulate women and people of color speak up with suggestions during intense teamwork exercises in the outdoor setting, and literally not be heard. It wasn't just that their suggestions were often ignored, at times their ideas had to be repeated by a male voice to be heard at all. It was clear that women and people of color could not "know". At the beginning I thought I had been thrown into a time warp and it was really 1969.

The revised strategy of reaching further down the organization to include women and people of color in the institute was a good strategy. Because these marginalized people had not yet reached the top ranks of the company in sufficient numbers, it was necessary to give some of them special access. As Harding (1991) states, "until the less powerful raise their voices to articulate their experiences (frequently a dangerous act), none of us can find the perspective from their lives" (p. 270). Their presence was the single most important diversity awareness strategy employed. As outsiders within, they moved the learnings from theoretical exercises to life changing experience.

Another strategy for increasing diversity awareness was employed during week three of the four-week program. This week focused on personal leadership effectiveness and strategies for change. Each executive received an in-depth feedback survey on her/his leadership style as observed by peers, supervisors, and subordinates. Several questions in the inventory addressed the issue of managing diversity. For example: creates an environment where everyone feels responsible for the quality of his/her work?; helps remove barriers to improved teamwork?; and appreciates the value of diversity in race, sex and age? After reviewing the feedback, each executive met with a trained coach/counselor to debrief the information and set goals for improvements. All participants developed a "personal action plan" for leadership improvement; some participants, based on feedback from their personal health profiles, changed their exercise and eating habits; other participants established a buddy system to help them monitor and discuss barriers to making change. For many people this proved to be a turning point in the construction of their inner eye.

An additional strategy used to change our inner eye was a simple game to help achieve breakthrough or creative thinking not only on the topic of diversity, but on any topic. As part of our stress management session we used humor, which led to using lateral thinking exercises. We employed a concept of lateral thinking to describe a way of thinking outside our normal boundaries. These exercises loosened us up, helping us to understand more about the value of multiple perspectives when looking at issues or problems. Someone posed the lateral thinking problem such as "I want to go home, but I can't go home, because the man with the mask is at home." Then everyone in the group asked yes/no questions until the problem was solved. In this case the solution is a baseball player on third base trying to go home but the catcher is there.

When I researched one minute mysteries, or lateral thinking questions, I changed many of them to include gender neutral language or I reversed the gender to force a different perspective. In the above case when the problem became " the woman with the mask is at home" participants did not immediately think of sports as a solution. When I used "man" the problem was solved more quickly. This became a teachable moment focusing on the importance of language and how it shapes and identifies our assumptions and biases.

Breaking out of the mold of our structured thinking about each other becomes a breakthrough in leading and solving problems. Time and again, I observed that "aha" kind of experience in people who opened up to each other's different ways of knowing in order to come up with a solution to problems -- or a new way of trying something to see how it works. Through examining the dynamics among and between men and women engaged in teaching and learning about leadership, I now believe that our strength is in our differences and our learning how to talk about those differences. We must break away from essentialist thinking about who can "know" leadership. We must use multiple lenses when designing, leading and evaluating educational programs.

Conclusion

We set out to examine the social constructions of our own inner eye by reflecting on our personal experiences and the accompanying discourse that surrounds the ideology of leadership. The exploration of feminist perspectives has given each of us a different lens for examining our knowledge and experience, hence, we conclude this paper first by sharing how this collaborative effort is reconstructing our understanding about leadership. We also address our initial question with suggestions for praxis, the application of our "knowing" to leadership education for women and men.

Reconstructing Our Inner Eye

Several feminists talk about reflecting while they write (Hacker, 1991; Smith, 1987a). They discuss the challenges of going inside ourselves to reflect on our learning, to revise what we know. The experience moves our fault line even if only to the center of a different place. In order to collaborate on this paper we had to confront the rituals of our own truths, our personal ways of knowing, and the walls that build themselves when understanding is too hard. As we struggled to hear and know each other's personal construction of the inner eye we were persistently reminded that one of the few things we have in common is our desire to learn together. We discovered that our fault lines are not the same, our ways of seeing and knowing are very divergent, and our aptitudes for effective communication are frequently inadequate to the task.

As white, female graduate students in education we have a common core of socially constructed experiences, yet, our personal backgrounds and professional experiences are quite different. We valued the richness of those differences enough to traverse our personal fault lines. As we proceeded, we discovered the difficulties of developing and understanding our own leadership experience. All of us tried not to take over. All of us tried to lead. All of us tried not to lead (by the male model) We found ourselves being so cautious about leading from a different perspective, not following a model based on domination, trying so hard to avoid essentialism that we didn't risk taking a stand. We became the ultimate relativists. Hearing each other, really hearing each other, meant a commitment to continue to try even when it was inordinately difficult. We are three fairly similar people with standpoints that are not very removed from the center struggling to get the picture. Now we try to imagine what it is like to move further out from the center and still try to accomplish the communication and the struggle. We often questioned the strength of our habits of mind and habits of heart to continue.

As we applied these very personal frustrations to our initial questions we began to surmise that for many men, relating to women's experience is frightening. For many women and men, hearing the experiences of people of color is too complex. Knowing in a different way is uncomfortable; for many of us it becomes a paradox. We want to expand our knowing, but in the struggle to communicate with empathy we learn that our socially constructed being cannot and will not stay the same. Many of us retreat at this point and in this way we silence the other. This may very well be the reason silence is so persistent.

Reconstructing the Education of Leaders

To break through this persistent silence we propose a model of leaders (and educators of leaders) as learners. We draw our perspective from feminist methodology which since its inception has challenged all of our traditional ways of knowing. Feminism promotes the exploration of multiple perspectives in a way that honors individual standpoints. Bennis, in his latest book on leadership describes the challenge of dealing with these complex subjects as a process of "messy existential groaning (transformed) into understandable issues (Bennis, 1989, p. 155). Calas and Smircich, professors in the School of Management at the University of Massachusetts, take a critical perspective of the organizational development literature, proposing that "embracing feminist re-visions, means also to embrace a reflexivity that constantly assesses the relationship between "knowledge" and "the ways of doing knowledge" (1990, p. 22). The words of sociologist bell hooks provide some guidelines for the notion of leaders as learners.

Hooks provides an example of an individual engaged in deep reflection about her experiences as a woman, as a black woman, as a participant in our society. She challenges us to establish dialogue, to speak with rather than to others, to be sure we listen, to know who our listeners are. She reminds us that we all have the capacity to dominate and that thinking critically about domination is more important than focusing on specific dominators. "It is necessary to remember that it is first the potential oppressor within that we must rescue--otherwise we cannot hope for an end to domination, for liberation" (1989, p. 21). Her call to document and share work that communicates how individuals confront differences constructively and successfully is another way of challenging us to behave as models of learners. She describes teaching as "being":

> ...I am really talking about cultivating habits of being that reinforce awareness that knowledge can be disseminated and shared on a number of fronts. The extent to which knowledge is made available, accessible, etc. depends on the nature of one's political commitments. (1990, p. 30-31)

The challenge we offer educators of leaders is to give equal voice to personal standpoint as a legitimate part of learning about leadership. The experiential nature of the corporate program illustrates the power of juxtaposing traditional ways of knowing with personal standpoint. The education in this program did not devalue the participants' traditional beliefs, instead it acknowledged the historical context from which they came. Freedom to personally explore new ways of thinking contributed to the program's success.

Other examples of exploring new ways of thinking and producing knowledge is emerging from the works of non-white feminist scholars who use personal standpoint in research and publications despite the fact that it is not a traditionally accepted version of scholarship. In taking this risk, they have had to overcome the potential oppressor within and subsequently they challenge us to do the same. If we can successfully rise to this challenge, we are freed to take further risks in how we educate ourselves and others. We can begin to incorporate nontraditional ways of knowing based on silenced perspectives into our educational practices.

We challenge teachers of leaders to model openmindedness--to juxtapose voices of men and women, voices of traditional authority and marginalized perspectives, voices of privileged Western culture and worldwide viewpoints, and voices of leadership discourse and personal standpoint. The dialogue emerging from this type of learning experience has the potential to construct a different ideology of leadership.

We are not the same "knowers" who began this paper. Each new piece of knowledge, each new experience, each new interaction created new versions of "me". We discovered that when we risk learning together, we cannot stay the same. Our new I/eye becomes part of an evolving ideology that has the increased possibility for practicing equity as a shared value. The knowing we gained from sharing standpoint reminds us that too frequently we become overwhelmed by societal issues and forget the power of personal relationships for transforming experience into knowledge.

One caution we offer to teachers of leadership is that today's way of knowing leadership is potentially tomorrow's ritual, tomorrow's version of truth with all the concomitant ceremonies, paradoxes and dangers. We are challenged and we offer a challenge to behave as learners, to continue to value communication, the essential element of evolving individuals and an evolving democracy which develops habits of mind and habits of heart.

REFERENCES

Acker, J., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1991). Objectivity and truth. In M. M. Fonow & J. A. Cook (Eds.), Beyond Methodology (pp. 133-153). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Anderson, G. (1990). Toward a critical constructivist approach to school administration: Invisibility, legitimation, and the study of non-events. Educational Administration Quarterly, 6 (1), 38.

Apple, M. (1990). Ideology and curriculum. New York: Routledge.

Bennis, W. (1989). On becoming a leader. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: Strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper and Row.

Berman, R. (1989). From Aristotle's dualism to materialist dialectics: Feminist transformation of science and society. In A. Jaggar & S. Bordo (Eds.), Gender/body/knowledge: Feminist reconstruction of being and knowing (pp. 224-255). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.

Calás, M. and Smircich, L. (in press). Re-writing gender into organizational theorizing: Directions from feminist perspectives. In M. I. Reed & M. D. Hughes (Eds.), Re-thinking organization: New directions in organizational research and analysis. London: SAGE.

Collins, P. H. (1991). Learning from the outsider within. In M. M. Fonow & J. A. Cook (Eds.), Beyond Methodology (pp. 35-59). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). Democracy and education. New York: MacMillan and Co.

Drucker, P. (1958). Technology, management and society. New York: Harper and Row.

Drucker, P. (1966). The effective executive. New York: Harper and Row.

Eisenstein, H. (1983). Contemporary feminist thought. Boston: G. K. Hall & Co.

Ferguson, K. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Flax, J. (1990). Thinking fragments: Psychoanalysis, feminism, and postmodernism in the contemporary west. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fleming, T. (1982). The progressive movement of educational administration from 1920-1950

Follett, M. P. (1949). Freedom and Coordination. London: Management Publications Trust, LTD.

Geertz, C. (1973). The interpretations of cultures. New York: Basic Books.

Gergen, K. J. (1988). Feminist Critique of science and the challenge of social epistemology. In M. M. Gergen (Ed.) Feminist thought and the structure of knowledge (pp. 27-48). New York: New York University Press.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Gergen, M. M. (1988). Toward a feminist metatheory and methodology in the social sciences. In M. M. Gergen (Ed.) Feminist thought and the structure of knowledge (pp. 87-104). New York: New York University Press.

Harding, S. (1987). Introduction: Is there a feminist method? In S. Harding (Ed.), Feminist methodology (pp. 1-14). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S.. (1990). Feminism, science, and the anti-enlightenment critiques. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed.), Feminism/postmodernism, (pp. 83-106). New York: Routledge.

Harding, S. (1991). Whose science? Whose knowledge? Ithica, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hartsock, N. (1987). The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In S. Harding (Ed.), Feminist methodology (pp. 157-180). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. (1976). The managerial woman. New York: Pocket Books.

hooks, b. (1989). Talking back. Boston: South End Press.

hooks, b. (1990). Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics. Boston: South End Press.

Kempner, K. (1991). Getting into the castle of educational administration. Peabody Journal of Education, 104-123.

Martin, J. (1990). Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. Organization Science, 1(4) 339-359.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McGregor, D. (1966), Leadership and motivation. Cambridge, MA: The M.I.T. Press.

Metcalf, H. & Urwick, L. (Eds.). (1942). Dynamic administration: The collected papers of Mary Parker Follett. New York: Harper and Brothers.

Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Velsor, E. V. (1987). Breading the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations? Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Myerhoff, B. (1978). Number our days. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Narayan, U. (1989). The project of feminist epistemology: Perspectives from a nonwestern feminist. In A. Jaggar & S. Bordo (Eds.), Gender/body/knowledge: Feminist reconstruction of being and knowing (pp. 256-269). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Peters, T, & Austin, N. (1985). A passion for excellence. New York: Warner Books.

Peters, T. & Waterman, R. (1982). In search of excellence. New York; Harper and Row.

Sergiovanni, T. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. SanDiego, CA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Smith, D. E. (1987a). The everyday world as problematic. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Smith, D. E. (1987b). Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology. In S. Harding (Ed.), Feminism and methodology (pp. 84-96). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wren, D. (1987). The evolution of management thought. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Zalesnik, A. (1989). The managerial mystique. New York: Harper and Row.

Appendix A
Parallels in the Work of Follett and Burns

Mary Parker Follett	James MacGregor Burns (1978)
But there is following. Leader and followers are both following the invisible leader--the common purpose. The best executives put this common purpose clearly before their group. While leadership depends on depth of conviction and the power coming therefrom, there must also be the ability to share that conviction with others, the ability to make purpose articulate. And then that common purpose becomes the leader. And I believe that we are coming more and more to act, whatever our theories, on our faith in the power of this invisible leader (1949, p. 55).	Leaders and followers are engaged in a common enterprise; they are dependent on each other, their fortunes rise and fall together, they share the results of planned change together. (p. 426)
Power is beginning to be thought of as the combined capacities of the group. We get power through effective relations. This means that some people are beginning to conceive of the leader, not as a the man in the group who is able to assert his individual will and get others to follow him, but as the one who knows how to relate these different wills so that they will have a driving force. He must know how to create a group power rather than express a personal power. He must make a team (1942, p. 290).	Leadership is collective. Leaders, in responding to their own motives, appeal to the motive bases of potential followers. As followers respond, a symbiosis relationship develops that binds leaders and followers together(p. 460). ....power is a relationship among persons (p. 12) These relationships also define the exercise of power as a collective act (p. 13)
Reciprocal relations is the main characteristic of leadership. Power is beginning to be thought of as the combined capacities of the group. We get power through effective relations (1942, p. 248).	We must see power and leadership not as things but as relationships (p. 11). Like power, leadership is relational, collective, and purposeful (p. 18).
Leader and teacher are synonymous terms (1942, p.267).	Leaders can also shape and alter and elevate the motives and values and goals of followers through the vital teaching role of leadership (p. 425).

The leader releases energy, unites energies, and all with the object not only of carrying out a purpose, but of creating further and larger purposes. (qualitative not quantitative) I mean purposes which will include more of those fundamental values for which most of us agree we are really living (1942, p. 269). ...leaders of the highest type do not conceive their task merely as that fof fulfilling purpose, but as also that of finding ever larger purposes to fulfill, more fundamental values to be reached (1942, p. 288). Group activity, organized group activity, should aim: to incorporate and express the desires, the experience, the ideals of the individual members of the group: also to raise the ideals , broaden the experience, deepen the desires of the individual members of the group (1949, p. 52)	Such leadership occurs when one or more persons engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher level of motivation and morality (p. 20). Leadership shares with power the central function of achieving purpose (p. 18). ...leaders hold enhanced influence at the higher levels of the need and value hierarchies. They can appeal to the more widely and deeply held values, such as justice, liberty, and brotherhood. They can expose followers to the broader values that contradict narrower ones or inconsistent behavior. They can refine aspirations and gratifications to help followers see their stake in new, program-oriented social movements. Most important, they can gratify lower needs so that higher motivations will arise to elevate the conscience of men and women. (p.43)
The leader sees one situation melting into another and has learned the mastery of that moment. We usually have the situation we make--no one sentence is more pregnant with meaning for business success. This is why the leader's task is so difficult, why the great leader requires great qualities--the most delicate and sensitive perceptions, imagination and insight, and at the same time courage and faith (1942, p. 263).	..intellectual leadership at its best, anticipates, mediates, and ultimately subdues experience with the weapons of imagination and intelligence (p. 168).

The leader makes the team. This is preeminently the leadership quality--the ability to organise all the forces there are in an enterprise and make them serve a common purpose. Men with this ability create a group power rather than express a personal power. They penetrate to the subtlest connections of the forces at their command, and make all these forces available and most effectively available for the accomplishment of their purpose (1942, p. 282).	In brief, leaders with motive and power bases tap followers' motives in order to realize the purposes of both leaders and followers.
Some writers tell us that the leader should represent the accumulated knowledge and experience of his particular group, but I think he should go far beyond this. It is true that the able executive learns from everyone around him, but it is also true that he is far more than the depository where the wisdom of the group collects. When leadership rises to genius it has the power of transforming, of transforming experience into power. And that is what experience is for, to be made into power. The great leader creates as well as directs power (1942, p. 258).	The premise of this leadership (transforming leadership) is that, whatever separate interests persons might hold, they are presently or potentially united in the pursuit of higher goals, the realization of which is tested by the significant change that represents the collective or pooled interests of leaders and followers (p.460).
But if the followers must partake in leadership, it is also true that we must have followership on the part of leaders. There must be a partnership of following (1942, p. 292).	..it is their (self-actualized leaders) capacity to learn from others and form the environment--the capacity to be taught.....Self-actualization ultimately means the ability to lead by being led(p. 117).